

### **REMARKS**

The final Office Action mailed March 23, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The rejection of claim 1 as being indefinite with respect to "the emulsion" is believed to have been addressed by the present amendment. Withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Turning to the rejection of claims 1, 13, 16 and 17 as failing to comply with the written description requirement, the language of "at least two directions" has been amended to recite "both the vertical and horizontal directions" as suggested in the Office Action. Further, Figure 3 is cancelled, and Figure 1 is amended to provide crossing arrows. It is believed that these steps overcome the rejection under §112, first paragraph, and withdrawal is respectfully requested. The objection to the drawings has also been attended to by the cancellation of Figure 3.

Turning now to the art rejection, without conceding the propriety of the art rejection, the two independent claims have been amended so that both recite that the assembly including a tubular inner layer and the reinforcing braided material is bent around a plurality of *rotatable wheels*, with the wheels *adjustable in both the horizontal and vertical directions*.

Referring to page 6 of the Office Action issued on November 1, 2006, it is believed that the references used in the rejection, other than Azari, are conceded by the Examiner to fail to teach or suggest adjustment of positions of any rollers or pins. In this regard, the present Office Action is understood to rely solely on Azari to supply this feature which is missing from all of the other references. Initially, Applicant reiterates the belief that nothing in Azari suggests combining it with the other references as proposed by the Examiner. However, in any event, it is respectfully submitted that Azari still does not need teach or suggest the presently claimed arrangement, including use of a plurality of rotatable wheels that are adjustable in both the horizontal and vertical directions.

At column 5, lines 63-66, Azari notes that its “pins 77 are press-fit into openings 78 . . . and . . . extend substantially parallel to the horizontal axis of the die assembly 30.” It is respectfully submitted that pins that are press-fit in the fashion described by Azari are not rotatable wheels. Moreover, it is unclear to Applicant how the press-fit pins can be adjusted in the vertical and horizontal directions, as recited in the amended claims. The Office Action points to a portion of Azari that refers to “varying the pin spacing.” However, based on the disclosure of Azari, it appears the only way to vary the pin spacing would be to remove some of the pins, thereby leaving fewer pins, or to manufacture a different device having different hole locations for the pins to be press fit into. This is also consistent with Azari referring to changing the number of pins in each section. It is respectfully submitted that neither of these approaches amounts to “adjusting in the horizontal and vertical direction” as is possible in the presently claimed invention. Azari also mentions altering the relative positions or diameters of the pins 77. However, again nothing in this suggests the use of wheels, and the method of “altering” the relative positions is not described. This sentence also refers to adding additional pins, and so again it is believed that Azari is talking about either adding or removing pins, or manufacturing whole different devices with holes in completely different places, as opposed to the adjustability that is recited in the present claims.


Entry of this amendment after final rejection is earnestly solicited. The issues in this application are well developed, and it is believed that the issue should not require an undue burden on the part of the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the application; the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 202-861-1696.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicant petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036 with reference to Attorney Docket No. **79287.21520**.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Leo J. Jennings  
Reg. No. 32,902

Date: June 21, 2007

Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: (202) 861-1500  
Fax: (202) 861-1783

Attachment: Proposed formal drawings of Figures 1 and 2

Appendix A

Submission of proposed formal drawings of Figures 1 and 2. No new matter has been introduced.

Amendment to the Drawings

Submitted at Appendix A are formal, proposed drawings of Figures 1 and 2. Figure 3 is being cancelled.